

USPTO 12/19/2003 4:14 PM PAGE 1/001 Fax Server
 TO: Auto-reply fax to 512472 97 COMPANY:

Auto-Reply Facsimile Transmission



TO: Fax Sender at 5124729887

Fax Information

Date Received:

12/19/2003 4:08:48 PM [Eastern Standard Time]

Total Pages:

15 (including cover page)

ADVISORY: This is an automatically generated return receipt confirmation of the facsimile transmission received by the Office. Please check to make sure that the number of pages listed as received in Total Pages above matches what was intended to be sent. Applicants are advised to retain this receipt in the unlikely event that proof of this facsimile transmission is necessary. Applicants are also advised to use the certificate of facsimile transmission procedures set forth in 37 CFR 1.8(a) and (b), 37 CFR 1.6(f). Trademark Applicants, also see the Trademark Manual of Examining Procedure (TMEP) section 306 et seq.

Received
Cover
Page

=====>

Dec 19 2003 3:54PM		Biggers & Ohanian, PLLC		5124729887		p.1	
Biggers & Ohanian, PLLC Patent Attorneys 800 Lavaca Street Austin, Texas 78701 (512) 472-9887 www.boggersohanian.com							
FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET							
DATE:	12/19/2003						
TO:	Examiner MD S. Elisee Group Art Unit 1697 TC2680 Before Final						
COMPANY:	United States Patent and Trademark Office						
FACSIMILE NO:	703-672-9314						
FROM:	H. Arif Ohsanian, Reg. No. 46,022						
RE:	Response to Office Action on Filed "Destination Device Based Call Identification"						
	Atty. Docket No. AUS920810823051 (0125)						
SERIAL NO.:	10/013,289						
NUMBER OF PAGES:	(Including Cover) 15						
COMMENTS:	Please see attached.						
<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p><small>I hereby certify that this facsimile transmission is a true and correct copy of the original document, and that it is intended for the use of the recipient.</small></p> <p><i>[Signature]</i></p> <p><small>Date: 12/19/03</small></p> </div>							
<p><small>Confidentiality Notice: Unless otherwise indicated or obvious from the nature of the transmittal, the information contained in this facsimile message is attorney-client privileged and confidential information intended only for the use of the intended recipient named above. If you are not the intended recipient, then any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you received this distribution in error, please immediately notify the sender by telephone at our message.</small></p>							
<p><small>© 2003 by ProgressFax, Cover Sheet-PTO.doc</small></p>							

#8
6/7/04

AUS920010819US1

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUN 04 2004

OFFICIAL

In re Application of:
Michael Wayne Brown, *et al.*

Serial No.: 10/015,281

Filed: December 12, 2001

Title: Intermediary Device Initialed
Caller Identification§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Group Art Unit: 2697

Examiner: Elahee, MD S

Atty Docket No.: AUS920010819US1

Mail Stop: Non-Fee Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Certificate of Transmission by Facsimile	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to Commissioner for Patents at 703-872-9333 on the date of signature below.	
Nancy Salami	<i>Nancy Salami</i>
Date	12/19/03

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION DATED OCTOBER 8, 2003

Dear Sir:

Claims 1-21, 52, and 53 are in the case. Applicants acknowledge with thanks the telephone conference with Examiner Elahee on Wednesday, December 10, 2003. In response to that telephone conference, Applicants present the remarks demonstrating that the case is in condition for allowance.

REMARKS

In a previous Office Action dated April 23, 2003, claims 1-21, 52, and 53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by Bartholomew *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,167,119) and under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Bartholomew in view of Stumer (U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0136363) or Yoon (U.S. Patent Application No. 2001/0047414). In a Response filed July 16, 2003, Applicants demonstrated that claims 1-21, 52, and 53 were not anticipated by Bartholomew and that the combination of Bartholomew and Stumer or Yoon cannot establish a prima facie case of obviousness.